

The **City Sand Quarry** case in Newfoundland is a frequently cited example in Canadian discussions of quarry blasting and land-use planning because it led to a substantial increase in the required separation distance between blasting operations and homes. However, compared with the Ontario cases (such as Pakenham), the publicly available record is relatively sparse, and much of what is repeated in later reports traces back to provincial planning documents rather than detailed investigation reports.

Summary

Reported facts	Details
Quarry	City Sand Quarry, Newfoundland and Labrador
Original setback	Approximately 300 metres
Incidents	Flyrock reportedly struck nearby homes on two separate occasions
Damage	Property damage to two houses in a residential subdivision
Injuries	No reported injuries found in publicly available sources
Regulatory response	Province required a 1,000-metre buffer between blasting and cottages or residences

The incidents

According to provincial planning documents and later research papers:

- The quarry was operating with a **300-metre blast setback**.
- During blasting, **flyrock travelled beyond the exclusion zone**.
- Rocks struck houses in an adjacent residential subdivision.
- Similar damage reportedly occurred on **two separate blasting occasions**.

The damage is generally described as property damage to residences. The available summaries do not provide detailed descriptions of:

- roof damage,
- window breakage,
- siding impacts, or
- exact flyrock distances.

Unlike the Pakenham case, I could not locate a publicly available engineering investigation describing the trajectory or maximum throw distance.

Regulatory response

The incidents prompted a significant policy change by Newfoundland and Labrador's **Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs**.

The Department reportedly required:

A minimum 1,000-metre buffer between blasting operations and cottages or residences.

This is one of the largest residential blast setbacks referenced in Canadian planning literature.

The requirement appears to have been adopted as a precautionary planning measure following the repeated flyrock incidents rather than as a direct calculation of the observed flyrock distance.

Why 1,000 metres?

The available literature indicates the province concluded that:

- a **300-metre setback** had proven inadequate,
- flyrock can exceed predicted distances,
- residential development warrants a larger margin of safety.

Unlike Ontario's recommendation of a **500-metre control zone** after the Pakenham incidents, Newfoundland reportedly adopted a much more conservative **1,000-metre separation** for residences and cottages in this context.

Damage

The sources consistently state that:

- **two houses** were damaged,
- the damage occurred during **two separate blasting events**.

I could not locate:

- insurance reports,

- photographs,
- engineering reports,
- court proceedings,
- or compensation records documenting the extent of the damage.

No injuries are reported in the available public sources.

Significance

The City Sand Quarry incidents are frequently cited because they illustrate that:

- flyrock can escape a **300-metre exclusion zone**,
- repeated incidents may justify much larger planning setbacks,
- provinces can respond through land-use policy rather than solely through changes to blasting practice.

The case has been used in reports advocating larger mandatory quarry setbacks, particularly when residential neighbourhoods are nearby.

What is well supported

The following points appear consistently across provincial planning and research documents:

- A **300-metre setback** was in place.
 - Flyrock damaged homes in a nearby residential subdivision on **two occasions**.
 - Following those incidents, the provincial Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs required a **1,000-metre buffer** from cottages or residences for comparable blasting operations.
-

What remains unclear

The publicly available record does **not** appear to include the level of technical detail available for cases like Pakenham. Specifically, I could not find:

- the dates of the two incidents,
- the exact location of the quarry within Newfoundland and Labrador,
- measured flyrock distances,
- photographs or engineering analyses,

- Ministry investigation reports,
- enforcement actions or prosecutions,
- or judicial decisions arising from the incidents.

As a result, while the **existence of the incidents and the resulting 1,000-metre buffer requirement are well documented in secondary planning literature**, many operational details have not been published in readily accessible primary sources. This makes the case more useful as a policy precedent than as a fully documented technical case study.

Get smarter responses, upload files